



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/009,932	01/21/1998	KOICHIRO TANAKA	35G2116	8061

5514 7590 05/24/2002

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

VU, NGOC YEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2002

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/009,932

Applicant(s)
Koichiro TANAKA et al.

Examiner
Ngoc-Yen VU

Art Unit
2612



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 1, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 ~~is/are~~ pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 13-16, 18-27, 30-33, 35-46, 49-52, 54-63, and 66-69 ~~is/are~~ rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 12, 17, 28, 29, 34, 47, 48, 53, 64, 65, and 70 ~~is/are~~ objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2612

Response to Amendment

1. The amendments, filed on 03/01/2002, have been entered and made of record. Claims 1-70 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-70 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1-4, 18-21, 35-40 and 54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahara et al. (US #5,412,400) in view of Oyashiki et al. (US #5,808,670).

Regarding claims 1-4, Takahara '400 teaches a camera control system comprising a display device (Figs. 19-24) that displays an image sensed by a camera, in accordance with an image signal output from the camera (col. 4 lines 13-27); a detection device that detects a figure scripted on a display screen on which the image is being displayed by said display device (Fig. 24, TV camera frame); a selection device (Fig. 24, device operation selection & direction/view selection) that selects a type of command for controlling the camera in accordance with a figure pattern which corresponds to the figure detected by said detection device (col. 12 line 48 - col. 17

Art Unit: 2612

line 10); an output device that outputs the command for controlling the camera selected by said selection device (col. 15 line 53 - col. 17 line 10); and a control device that controls the camera on the basis of the camera control command output from said output device (col. 4 lines 13-46; col. 15 line 53 - col. 17 line 10).

Claims 1-4 differ from Takahara in that the claims require the selection device collates a pattern of the figure detected by said detection device with figure patterns previously stored in a storage device. However, the limitation is well known in the art as shown in Oyashiki '670. In the same field of endeavor, Oyashiki teaches a method and system for camera control with monitoring area wherein the positions indicative of the image picked-up positions of a camera unit (5) are produced in advance and stored in a controller (3) (Figs. 1-5; col. 5 line 28 - col. 6 line 53; col. 7 line 15 - col. 8 line 6). In column 5, lines 16+, Oyashiki teaches a point input unit (4) for designating a given point on the monitor screen (1). Oyashiki also teaches that the controller (3) collates a pattern of figures detected by said point input unit with figure patterns previously stored in the controller (col. 5 line 28 - col. 6 line 53; col. 7 line 15 - col. 8 line 6). In light of the teaching from Oyashiki, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the monitoring system taught in Takahara by storing figure patterns in a storage device allowing simple operations of a desired camera.

Regarding claims 18-21, the subject matter in these claims can be found in claims 1-4.

Regarding claims 35-40 and 54-57, they are method claims corresponding to claims 18-21 in which the subject matter can be found in claims 1-4. It is noted that Takahara teaches that the

Art Unit: 2612

camera control system is a computer which can download programs stored in respective recording medium.

5. Claims 9-10, 13-16, 26-27, 30-33, 45-46, 49-52, 62-63 and 66-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahara in view of Oyashiki, as applied to claims 1, 18, 35 and 54 above, and further in view of Cortjens et al. (US #5,568,183).

As to claims 9-10, the claims differ from Takahara and Oyashiki in that the claims require if said detection device detects an arrow is scripted on the display screen, then said output device outputs a control command for control of at least one of pan and tilt of the camera according to the direction of the detected arrow, wherein said output means determines a controlled amount of at least one of the pan and tilt of the camera according to a length of the detected arrow. However, it is well known in the art to include a graphical user interface for configuration and control of a camera using scripted arrows on the display screen, as taught in Cortjens (col. 14 line 55 - col. 16 line 56). In light of the teaching from Cortjens, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the monitoring system taught in Takahara and Oyashiki by controlling the camera(s) using a graphical user interface having scripted arrows:

As to claims 13-14, Cortjens teaches that if said detection device detects a substantially rectangular figure is scripted on the display screen, then said output device outputs a command for controlling a zoom ratio according to a size of the substantially rectangular figure detected, wherein if said detection device detects a substantially rectangular figure is scripted on the display

Art Unit: 2612

screen, then said output device further outputs a control command for performing at least one of pan and tilt of the camera such that an image displayed at a center of the substantially rectangular figure is positioned at a center of the display surface (col. 16 line 57 - col. 18 line 47).

As to claims 15-16, Cortjens teaches that if said detection device detects a crisscross figure is scripted on the display screen, then said output device outputs a command for controlling a zoom ratio in the zoom-out direction according to a size of the crisscross figure detected, wherein said output means outputs a control command for performing at least one of pan and tilt of the camera such that an image displayed at a point of intersection of the two segments forming the crisscross figure is positioned at the center of the display surface (col. 16 line 57 - col. 18 line 47).

As to claims 26-27, the subject limitation in these claims can be found in claims 9-10, respectively.

As to claims 30-31, the subject limitation in these claims can be found in claims 13-14, respectively.

As to claims 32-33, the subject limitation in these claims can be found in claims 15-16, respectively.

Regarding claims 45-46, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 26-27, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 26-27.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claims 49-52, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 30-33, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 30-33.

Regarding claims 62-63, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 26-27, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 26-27.

Regarding claims 66-69, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 30-33, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 30-33. It is noted that Takahara teaches that the camera control system is a computer which can download programs stored in respective recording medium.

6. Claims 5-8, 22-25, 41-44, and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahara in view of Oyashiki, as applied to claims 1, 18, 35 and 54 above, and further in view of Kawai et al. (JP # 4-302587).

As to claims 5-8, Cortjens teaches that if an action of depicting a segment from right to left, from left to right, from bottom to top or from top to bottom on the display surface of said display means, then the output means outputs a command for leftward pan, rightward pan, upward tilt or downward tilt control, respectively of the camera (col. 14, line 55 - col. 16 line 56). However, claims 5-8 differ from Takahara, Oyashiki and Cortjens in that the claims further require that these pan and tilt commands are output from the output means according to the

Art Unit: 2612

length of the segment. The limitation is well known in the art as shown in Kawai. In the same field of endeavor, Kawai '587 teaches a video camera control system for controlling a video camera (4) (see Fig. 1) wherein the commands for controlling the camera are input via a mouse 9 on a window 7 of a screen 6 (see the translated copy of Kawai on pages 2-4). In figures 4-5, Kawai further teaches that the window has segments from A to I, wherein the pan and tilt commands for controlling the camera 4 are outputted according to the length of these segments (see pages 5-7). In light of the teaching from Kawai, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the camera control system taught in Takahara, Oyashiki and Cortjens by outputting upward and downward pan/tilt commands according to the length of the segment so as allow the user to specifically designate the pan and tilt amounts using a mouse on a display device.

As to claims 22-25, the subject limitation in these claims can be found in claims 5-8, respectively.

Regarding claims 41-44, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 22-25, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 22-25.

Regarding claims 58-61, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 22-25, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 22-25. It is noted that Takahara teaches that the camera control system is a computer which can download programs stored in respective recording medium.

Art Unit: 2612

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 11-12, 17, 28-29, 34, 47-48, 53, 64-65 and 70 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. **Any response to this office action should be mailed to:**

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2612

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

(for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.,

Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Ngoc-Yen Vu** whose telephone number is (703) 305-4946. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri from 8 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wendy Garber**, can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

NYV

05/17/2002


Ngoc-Yen Vu
Primary Examiner
Group Art Unit 2612